

REMARKS

Definiteness. The Examiner rejects all pending claims as supposedly indefinite. The undersigned has amended various of the pending claims with a goal of addressing the supposed indefiniteness.

5

Art rejections. All pending claims have been rejected as supposedly unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,065,873 to Jones, disclosed to the USPTO by the applicant, either taken alone or in a two-way combination with KR 1020020020562, also disclosed to the USPTO by the applicant.

10 Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled, and their limitations incorporated into claim 9. In this way it is intended that amended Claim 8 may be more clearly distinguished from the flying saucer toy disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 4,065,873.

Regarding the differences between the present claimed invention and U.S. Patent No. 4,065,873, it is
15 noted that the micro aerial vehicle of the present invention includes a rotor that has a plurality of blades and a hub connecting the blades. The rotor provides a lifting force to a vehicle body. Also, the micro aerial vehicle of the present invention includes fixed-wings for canceling the reaction torque that occurs by rotation of the rotor. The reaction torque affects the vehicle body that should rotate in a direction
20 opposite to a rotation direction of the rotor. However, the vehicle body does not rotate in a direction opposite to a rotation direction of the rotor because of the fixed-wings that cancel the reaction torque. Thus, it is possible to change the flying direction of the vehicle body in a desired manner, which is the most important feature of the present invention.

In contrast, U.S. Patent No. 4,065,873 discloses that when a propeller (corresponding to the rotor of the
25 invention) rotates, an annular body (corresponding to the vehicle body of the invention) rotates in a direction opposite to a rotation direction of the propeller, and thus, the flying saucer toy flies. However, if the annular body rotates in direction opposite to a rotation direction of the propeller, it is impossible to change the flying direction of the toy in a desired manner. This has been described in the specification of the present invention as a problem of the prior art.

30

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Carl Oppedahl
PTO Reg. No. 32746